

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-11142

FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT MARCH 14, 2012 JOHN LEY CLERK

D.C. Docket No. 1:09-cv-00817-CB-M

ANGELA F. AMOS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MOBILE COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Alabama

(March 14, 2012)

Before BARKETT, HULL, Circuit Judges, and HINKLE,* District Judge.

*Honorable Robert L. Hinkle, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida, sitting by designation.

PER CURIAM:

Angela Amos, an African-American female, was the full-time Director of Pharmacy at the Mobile County Health Department ("MCHD") prior to her termination. A white male was hired to replace her on a part-time basis. Amos alleges that she was discriminated against based on race and sex and unlawfully retaliated against for complaining about the allegedly discriminatory treatment when she was placed on administrative leave and eventually terminated. She alleges that, during her fifteen-month tenure as Pharmacy Director, her immediate supervisor, Clinical Director Susan Stiegler, treated her differently than she treated the previous Pharmacy Director Philip Brown (a white male) in three respects: (1) Amos was required to schedule and document "sick time"; (2) Brown was assigned to interview prospective Pharmacy Technicians while Amos was not; and (3) Stiegler "yelled" and "spoke" to Amos very harshly while not treating Brown the same way.

Initially, as to her discrimination claims, we affirm the district court's conclusion that Amos has not established that she suffered from any adverse employment actions and that Amos has not produced sufficient evidence from which a jury could conclude that MCHD discriminated against her on the basis of race and sex.

As to her retaliation claims, Amos alleges that she was wrongfully placed on leave immediately upon complaining about discrimination against her. Having reviewed this record, we find no reversible error. Assuming that Amos established a prima facie case, the district court did not err in concluding that MCHD stated legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons for its action and that Amos failed to show that these reasons were pretextual.

AFFIRMED.